IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:	)	
	)	
Inventors: Andrew Ferlitsch	)	
	)	
Serial No.: 10/659,513	) ATTORNEY FILE NO.	
	) SLA1305	
	)	
Filed: September 10, 2003	)	
	) Art Unit: 2625	
Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR	) Customer No.: 55,286	
MAINTAINING A DEVICE	) Examiner: Rodriguez,	
JOB HISTORY	) Lennin	
	) Conf. No.: 3618	

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

BRIEF ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the rejection by Examiner Lennin R. Rodriguez, Group Art Unit 2625, of claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 20, 22-28, 30-38, and 41-42 as set forth in the CLAIMS APPENDIX.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc., as assignee of the present application in the United States Patent Office, with a recordation date of September 10, 2003 at Reel 014485, Frame 0359.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

None.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 2, 8, 12, 18-19, 21, 29, and 39-40 are canceled.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 20, 22-28, 30-38, and 41-42 are in the application.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 20, 22-28, 30-38, and 41-42 are rejected.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 20, 22-28, 30-38, and 41-42 are appealed.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The claims were amended in a response received at the PTO on May 13, 2009. These claim amendments have been entered.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Conventionally, an imaging device (printer/scanner/fax) does not keep a record of jobs performed, after performance of the job. A user may be able to obtain a report of jobs that have not been despooled to the imaging device (specification: page 1, ln. 19 to page 3, ln. 5, Figs. 1 and 2). Other monitoring processes use an SNMP trap (page 3, ln. 6-23, Fig. 3), email notification (page 3, ln. 24 to page 4, ln. 13, Fig. 4), or web posting (page 5, ln. 1-6, Fig. 6) to detect errors or job status. Some imaging devices maintain an internal job history, but provide no means for a client computer to access the history (page 4, ln. 14-26, Fig. 5). Alternately, a job status estimate for each client device can be maintained at the respective client devices (page 5, ln. 7-23, Fig. 7). None of these methods provide a means for a client to accurately compile a complete record of print jobs performed on a particular imaging device.

Claim 1 recites a method for maintaining a device job history on an imaging device (specification, page 22, ln. 6-11, page 23, ln. 7-12, and Fig. 14). Step 1402 sends jobs, along with a network address associated with a client sending the jobs, to an imaging device for printing (page 22, ln. 6 and page 23, ln. 7-9). Step 1404 makes a record of the jobs (page 22, ln. 6-7). Step 1406 maintains the job record in the imaging device, after the performance of the jobs on the imaging device printing the job (page 22, ln. 7-10). Step 1408 filters the job record to retain a history associated with a client by matching the client network address to jobs having the same network address (page 22, ln. 10-11 and page 23, ln. 11-12).

Claim 41 recites a method for maintaining a device job history on a client (specification, page 22, ln. 6-11 and 24, page 23, ln. 11-12, and Fig. 14). Step 1402 sends jobs, along with a network address associated with a client, to an imaging device for printing (page 22, ln. 6 and page 23, ln. 7-9). Step 1404 makes a record of the jobs (page 22, ln. 6-7). Step 1407 sends the job record to the client (page 212, ln. 24). Step 1408 filters the job record at the client, to retain a history associated with a client by matching the client network address to jobs having the same network address (page 22, ln. 10-11 and page 23, ln. 11-12).

Claim 20 recites a system for selectively maintaining a device job history on an imaging device (specification; page 9, ln. 22 to page 10, ln. 1, page 11, ln. 1-3, page 13, ln. 1-2, and Fig. 9). The system 900 comprises a client 902 having an interface on line 904 for sending jobs along with a client network address (page 9, ln. 23-25 and page 13, ln. 1-2). An imaging device 906 has an interface on line 904 to accept jobs. The imaging device 906 prints the jobs for the client 902 (page 9, ln 25-26). A repository 908 resides in the imaging device 906 and has an interface on line 910 to accept a record of the jobs performed by the device 906 (page 9, ln. 26 to page 10, ln 1). The repository 908 maintains the job record after the performance of the job, and filters the job record by matching the client network address to jobs having the same network address, to create a filtered history of jobs associated with the client 902 (page 11, ln. 1-3).

Claim 42 recites a system for selectively maintaining an imaging device job history on a client (specification; page 9, ln. 22 to page 10, ln. 3, page 10, ln. 26 to page 11, ln. 3, page 13, ln. 1-2, and Fig. 9). The

system 900 comprises a client 902 having an interface on line 904 for sending jobs along with a client network address (page 9, ln. 23-25 and page 13, ln. 1-2). An imaging device 906 has an interface on line 904 to accept jobs. The imaging device 906 prints the jobs for the client 902 (page 9, ln 25-26). A repository 908 resides in the imaging device 906 and has an interface on line 910 to accept a record of the jobs performed by the imaging device 906 (page 9, ln. 26 to page 10, ln 1). The repository 908 maintains the job record after the performance of the job, and sends the job record to the client upon request (page 10, ln. 1-3 and 21-23). The client 902 filters the job record by matching the client network address to jobs having the same network address, to create a filtered history of jobs associated with the client 902 (page 10, ln. 26 to page 11, ln. 3).

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1.   Whether claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 13-17, 20-26, 28, 30, 32, 36-38, and 41-42 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Carney et al. ("Carney"; US 2002/0080389) in view of admitted prior art (APA), and Richter et al. ("Richter"; US 6,678,068).

2.   Whether claims 6, 27, and 33-35, and 40 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Carney, APA, Richter, and further in view of Kullick et al. ("Kullick"; US 5,898,823).

3.   Whether claims 10 and 31 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Carney, Richter, APA, and further in view of Saruwatari (US 2002/0059361).

ARGUMENT

1. The rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 13-17, 20-26, 28, 30, 32, 36-38, and 41-42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to Carney et al. ("Carney"; US 2002/0080389) in view of admitted prior art ("APA"; US 2005/0052684 – the instant application) and Richter et al. ("Richter"; US 6,678,068).

CLAIMS 1, 20, 41, and 42

In Section 5 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 13-17, 20-26, 28, 30, 32, 36-38, and 41-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to Carney et al. ("Carney"; US 2002/0080389) in view of admitted prior art ("APA"; US 2005/0052684 – the instant application) and Richter et al. ("Richter"; US 6,678,068). The Office Action acknowledges that Carney fails to disclose the limitations of sending jobs to a device along with a client network address, and filtering the job record to create a filtered history of jobs associated with the client. The Office Action states that the APA discloses the sending of jobs with a client network address, and that it would have been obvious to combine the sending of jobs with client network addresses, with Carney, because it is desirable to provide an economical, full function local print function in a network computing environment.

The Office Action also states that Richter teaches filtering the job record to create a filtered history of jobs associated with the client, and that it would have been obvious to combine a job history filtering, with the APA and Carney, "which allows a client user to view information regarding one or more output printing devices, controllably send one or

more print jobs to any of the output printing devices, and receive information regarding each of the print jobs. It would also be advantageous to provide an administrative print server application, whereby an administrative user can view and control the status of a print system having one or more client computers and one or more print servers and printing output devices. The development of such a printing system would constitute a major technological advance."

Carney discloses a process that monitors print jobs. As acknowledged in the Office Action, Carney does not disclose any means of filtering or cross-referencing print jobs to the clients sending the jobs.

In the Applicant's specification, a monitoring process is described where the network address of the local client is embedded in the print job being sent to a printer (page 2, ln. 19-22, Fig. 2).

At col. 2, ln. 7-15, Richter discloses a prior art process of a print driver user interface that permits a user to select print options and a destination printer. Generally, Richter discloses a system that establishes a 2-way link between a client computer and a printing system, where the printing system includes a print server interposed between the client computer and the printers (col. 3, ln. 22-39). The print server is able to provide information to the client such as job status, and when a "jam" occurs (col. 5, ln. 18-30).

The Office Action states that Richter discloses filtering the job record to create a filtered history of jobs associated with the client,

citing col. 23, ln. 7-15. This assertion is inaccurate, as the cited section states (from claim 1):

> a client print server link on at least one of the at least one client computers for receiving and displaying the at least one of the plurality of features from the output printing device through the network connection, for filtering information relevant to the client computer, and for receiving and displaying status of each of the at least one print job sent to the output printing device from the client computer, based upon the filtered information.

The cited section states that the client print server link *on at least one client computer* permits a client computer to filter information relevant to that computer, and to receive and display the status of at least one print job based upon the filtered information. Elsewhere, Richter defines a "client print server link application 16" as being located on a client computer 12, which permits a client to access printer servers 32an-32n and output devices 40a-40n through a two-way communication link (col. 5, ln. 14-22).

The above-cited passages do not disclose maintaining a job history. In fact, the cited passage does not even disclose the retention of "filtered information". More explicitly, the passages do not disclose maintaining a job history *in the imaging device*.

The Office Action also states that Richter discloses jobs being associated with respective clients, and stored as a job log, citing col. 9, ln. 66 through col. 10, ln. 2, and col. 22, ln. 4-5 (Fig. 30).

Col. 9. ln. 66 through col. 10, ln. 2, states, "(i)n a preferred embodiment of the client print server link 16, stored information, such as print logs, and job logs, can either be stored at the client computer 12, at

the print server 32, or within an administrative print server link 26." The above-quoted passage does not state that a print log or job log is maintained by an imaging device.

Col. 22, ln. 4-5 states, "(o)ther administrative job log controls include update list 410, store to disk control 412, print job list control 414, and delete selected job control 416", see Fig. 30. Again, the print log is not maintained by an imaging device, but rather, by an administrative workstation 24 (see Fig. 2).

An invention is unpatentable if the differences between it and the prior art would have been obvious at the time of the invention. As stated in MPEP § 2143, the *KSR International Co. v Teleflex Inc.* decision (82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395-1397, 2007) suggests 7 exemplary rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness, which include:

A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results;

B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results;

C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices (methods, or products) in the same way;

D) Applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results;

E) "Obvious to try" – choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success;

F) Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on

design incentives or other market forces if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art;

G) Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in prior art would have lead one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or the combine prior art references teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

The Office Action states that modifications to Carney would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in light of the APA and Richter. This rejection appears to be most closely grounded in the G) rationale - Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in prior art would have lead one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or the combine prior art references teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

With respect to this rationale, MPEP 2143 (G) states that the rejection must articulate the following criteria to resolve the *Graham* factual analysis:

(1) a finding that there was some teaching, suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings;

(2) a finding that there was a reasonable expectation of success; and

(3) whatever additional findings based on the Graham factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.

With respect to the above-referenced first factual analysis criteria, the APA and Richter reference has been combined with Carney

based upon the assumption that the combination of references discloses all the limitations recited in Applicant's claims 1, 20, and 41-42. While the combination of Carney and Richter may potentially be cited as suggesting a means for a client to access print-job related information, the combination does not disclose an imaging device that maintains a job record.

With respect to claims 1 and 20, none of the Carney, APA, or Richter references recite an imaging device that filters the job history by client network address. With respect to claims 41-42, none of the references disclose a client that receives a job history from the imaging device, and creates a filtered history of jobs associated with only that client.

The Office Action states it would have been obvious to combine Richter, with the APA and Carney, by citing the "advantages" mentioned in the Richter disclosure (col. 3, ln-8-19). The advantages mentioned by Richter are to view information regarding one or more output printing devices, controllably send one or more print jobs to any of the output printing devices, to provide an administrative print server application, whereby an administrative user can view and control the status of a print system having one or more client computers and one or more print servers and printing output devices, and that the development of such a printing system would constitute a major technological advance. In traverse, it is noted that none of the above-mentioned advantages are a reason to combine the three references. More important, none of these advantages suggest the limitation of the job history being maintained by the imagining device. While Richter discloses a job log being maintained

by an administrative workstation, his method is more indirect and less accurate, as the workstation determines the status of printed jobs by polling the print servers feeding jobs to the printers. The claimed invention is inherently more accurate, as the device performing the job is the same device maintaining the job record.

A *prima facie* analysis of motivation is especially critical since the rejection is predicated on limitations that are not explicitly disclosed in the prior art references. The claimed invention can only be obvious if an artisan makes substantial modifications to the Carney reference. However, there is nothing in the APA or Richter references that suggests such a modification.

Neither does the obviousness rejection provide evidence that such a modification would have been obvious to one with skill in the art based upon what was well known at the time of the invention. "(A)nalysis [of whether the subject matter of a claim would have been obvious] need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim, for a court can take account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ." *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1740-41, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007). However, if the *prima facie* rejection is supported by what was known by a person of ordinary skill in the art then additional evidence should have been provided. Notable, when the source or motivation is not from the prior art references, "the evidence" of motive will likely consist of an explanation or a well-known principle or problem-solving strategy to be applied". *DyStar*, 464 F.3d at 1366, 80 USPQ2d at 1649.

Some of the principles mentioned to support the combination of the references (Richter's advantages) include viewing information regarding a printing device, sending print jobs, receive information regarding print jobs, or to permit an administrative user can view and control the status of a print system having one or more client computers and one or more print servers and printing output devices. While Richter, and many other prior art systems may include mechanisms to perform the above-mentioned functions, the listing of these functions is not evidence that it was well known at the time of the invention to maintain a job history in an imaging device.

With respect to the second analysis criteria needed to support the G) obviousness rationale, even if an expert were given the Carney, APA, and Richter references as a foundation, no evidence has been provided to show that there is a reasonable expectation of success in the claimed invention. That is, there can be no reasonable expectation of success if the references, and what was known by artisan at the time of the invention, do not teach all the limitations of the claimed invention.

In summary, the Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obvious has not been supported since the combination of Carney, the APA, and Richter does not explicitly disclose every limitation of claims 1, 20, and 41-42. Neither has a case been supported that Carney can be modified to supply the missing limitations in view of what was well known by a person of skill at the time of the invention.

CLAIMS 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 13-17, 21-26, 28, 30, 32, AND 36-38

Claims 3-5, 7, 9, 11, and 13-17 are dependent from claim 1, and claims 22-26, 28, 30-32, and 36-37 are dependent from claim 20. As a result, they include all the limitations of claims 1 and 20, and can be distinguished from the cited prior for the same reasons as expressed above.

2. ***The rejection of claims 6, 27, and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to Carney, APA, Richter, and further in view of Kullick et al. ("Kullick"; US 5,898,823).***

CLAIMS 6, 27, AND 33-35

In Section 6 of the Office Action claims 6, 27, and 33-35, and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Carney, APA, Richter, and further in view of Kullick et al. ("Kullick"; US 5,898,823). The Office Action it is acknowledges that the combination of Carney, APA, and Richter fails to disclose the limitation of a client memory and downloading the job record from the job repository, but that Kullick discloses these limitations, and that it would have been obvious to combine references to provide the user with a locally stored copy of the job record.

Kullick does not disclose the limitations of an imaging device making a job record where jobs are matched to client addresses. Kullick does not disclose an imaging device maintaining such a job history. Therefore, even if the feature of a client memory is added to Carney/APA/Richter, the combination still does not disclose the limitations of filtering a job history record by client address, and maintaining the job history in an imaging device. These missing

limitations are not suggested by the assertion that is would be desirable for a user to have a locally stored copy of the record, since none of the references suggest even making such a record. Further, no evidence has been provided to show that there is a reasonable expectation of success in the claimed invention.

A *prima facie* case of obvious has not been supported since the combination of Carney, APA, Richter, and Kullick does not explicitly disclose every limitation of claims 1 and 20. Neither has a case been supported that Carney can be modified to supply the missing limitations in view of what was well known by a person of skill at the time of the invention. Therefore, the rejection of claims 6, 27, and 33-35 should be removed.

3. *The rejection of claims 10 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to Carney, Richter, APA, and further in view of Saruwatari (US 2002/0059361).*

CLAIMS 10 AND 31

In Section 7 of the Office Action claims 10 and 31 have been rejected over Carney, Richter, APA, and further in view of Saruwatari (US 2002/0059361). The Office Action acknowledges that Carney/Richter/APA fail to disclose a client sending an IP address, but that Saruwatari discloses this feature, and that it would have been obvious to combine the references because it would have been easier to locate a client in a printing network.

Even if Saruwatari's IP address is combined with Carney/Richter/APA, the combination does not disclose the limitations of

filtering a job history record by client address, and maintaining the job history in the imaging device. These missing limitations are not suggested by the assertion that Saruwatari's IP address would make a client easier to find. Further, no evidence has been provided to show that there is a reasonable expectation of success in the claimed invention.

A *prima facie* case of obvious has not been supported since the combination of Carney, Richter, APA, and Saruwatari does not explicitly disclose every limitation of claims 1 and 20. Neither has a case been supported that Carney can be modified to supply the missing limitations in view of what was well known by a person of skill at the time of the invention. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 10 and 31 be removed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

It is submitted that for the reasons pointed out above, the claims in the present application clearly and patentably distinguish over the cited references. Accordingly, the Examiner should be reversed and ordered to pass the case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:_____9/28/2009_____   /Gerald Maliszewski/_____
                                     Gerald Maliszewski
                                     Registration No. 38,054

Customer Number 55,286
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA 92198-2829
Telephone: (858) 451-9950
Facsimile: (858) 451-9869
gerry@ipatentit.net

CLAIMS APPENDIX

IN THE CLAIMS:

1. (previously presented) A method for maintaining a device job history on an imaging device, the method comprising:

sending jobs, along with a network address associated with a client sending the jobs, to an imaging device for printing;

making a record of the jobs;

maintaining the job record in the imaging device, after the performance of the jobs on the imaging device printing the job; and,

filtering the job record to retain a history associated with a client by matching the client network address to jobs having the same network address.

2. canceled

3. (previously presented) The method of claim 1 wherein maintaining the job record includes the imaging device monitoring processes selected from the group including the device status, job status, and communications to the device.

4. (previously presented) The method of claim 1 further comprising:

viewing the filtered job record.

5. (previously presented) The method of claim 4 wherein viewing the filtered job record includes accessing a viewable copy of the filtered job record obtained from a node selected from the group

including the client sending the job, the server managing the device jobs, and a web page associated with the imaging device.

6.   (previously presented)   The method of claim 1 further comprising:

downloading the filtered job record from the imaging device, to the client.

7.   (original)   The method of claim 4 further comprising:

interrupting a job with an action selected from the group including canceling a job, continuing a job, and modifying a job.

8.   canceled

9.   (previously presented)   The method of claim 1 wherein sending jobs along with a network address includes using a network address selected from the group including a network address embedded in transport layer transmission packets and a network address embedded with the job in data layer communications.

10.   (previously presented)   The method of claim 1 wherein sending jobs along with a network address includes using the client's Internet Protocol (IP) address.

11.   (previously presented)   The method of claim 1 further comprising:

viewing the filtered job record as follows:

        making an HTTP request, by the client, to a web page associated with the device; and,

        sending a record of filtered jobs from the imaging device, to the web page.

    12.   canceled

    13.   (previously presented)   The method of claim 1 further comprising:

        merging imaging device communications with the filtered job record.

    14.   (previously presented)   The method of claim 1 further comprising:

        merging client communications with the filtered job record.

    15.   (previously presented)   The method of claim 3 wherein sending jobs to the imaging device for printing includes sending image processing jobs to an imaging device selected from the group including printers, copiers, fax machines, multifunctional peripheral (MFP) devices, scanners, electronic whiteboards, and document servers.

    16.   (previously presented)   The method of claim 3 wherein monitoring processes selected from the group including the device status, job status, and communications to the device includes:

        monitoring the status of job raster image processing (RIP);

monitoring the status of jobs queued on the image processing device;

monitoring the status of jobs after they have been despooled from a node selected from the group including local and network spoolers;

monitoring the status of jobs that have been completed by the imaging device; and,

monitoring the status of jobs spooled at a node selected from the group including local and network spoolers.

17.   (original)   The method of claim 16 further comprising:

interrupting an image processing job with a action selected from the group including canceling a job, continuing a job, and modifying a job; and,

wherein monitoring processes selected from the group including the device status, job status, and communications to the imaging device includes monitoring the status of the interrupted job.

18-19. canceled

20.   (previously presented)   A system for selectively maintaining a device job history on an imaging device, the system comprising:

a client having an interface for sending jobs along with a client network address;

an imaging device having an interface to accept jobs, the imaging device printing the jobs for the client; and,

a repository residing in the imaging device having an interface to accept a record of the jobs performed by the device, the repository maintaining the job record after the performance of the job, and filtering the job record by matching the client network address to jobs having the same network address to create a filtered history of jobs associated with the client.

21.   canceled

22.   (previously presented)   The system of claim 20 further comprising:

a server having an interface to the client and the imaging device, the server managing jobs sent to the imaging device by the client.

23.   (previously presented)   The system of claim 20 wherein the imaging device monitors processes selected from the group including the device status, job status, and communications to the device.

24.   (original)   The system of claim 22 further comprising:

a display having an interface for accessing a viewable copy of the filtered job record.

25.   (original)   The system of claim 24 wherein the display accesses a viewable copy of the filtered job obtained from a node selected from the group including the client and the server managing the device jobs.

26. (previously presented) The system of claim 25 further comprising:

a web page having an interface to receive the filtered history of job downloads from the repository residing with the imaging device; and,

wherein the display accesses a viewable copy of the filtered history of jobs obtained from a node selected from the group including the client, the server managing the device jobs, and the web page.

27. (previously presented) The system of claim 21 further comprising:

a local memory residing with the client having an interface to accept a download of the filtered history of jobs from the imaging device repository.

28. (previously presented) The system of claim 20 wherein the client has a user interface for interrupting a job sent to the imaging device with an action selected from the group including canceling a job, continuing a job, and modifying a job.

29. canceled

30. (previously presented) The system of claim 20 wherein the client sends a network address selected from the group including a network address embedded in transport layer transmission

packets and a network address embedded with the job in data layer communications.

31.   (previously presented)   The system of claim 20 wherein the client sends the client's Internet Protocol (IP) address as the network address.

32.   (previously presented)   The system of claim 20 further comprising:

a web page having an interface to receive the filtered history of job downloads from the repository residing with the imaging device;

wherein the client makes an HTTP request to the web page associated with the imaging device; and,

wherein the repository sends the filtered history of jobs from the imaging device, to the web page for client access.

33.   (previously presented)   The system of claim 20 the system further comprising:

a local memory residing with the client having an interface to accept a download of the filtered history of jobs from the repository.

34.   (previously presented)   The system of claim 33 wherein the client collects a record of device communications, and merges the imaging device communications with the filtered history of jobs in the local memory.

35. (previously presented) The system of claim 33 wherein the client collects a record of client communications, and merges the client communications with the filtered history of jobs in the local memory.

36. (previously presented) The system of claim 20 wherein the imaging device is selected from the group including printers, copiers, fax machines, multifunctional peripheral (MFP) devices, scanners, electronic whiteboards, and document servers.

37. (previously presented) The system of claim 36 wherein the imaging device monitors device status, job status, and communications to the device selected from the group including:

the status of job raster image processing (RIP);

the status of jobs queued on the image processing device;

the status of jobs after they have been despooled from a node selected from the group including local and server spoolers;

the status of jobs that have been completed by the imaging device; and,

the status of jobs spooled at a node selected from the group including local and server spoolers.

38. (original) The system of claim 37 wherein the client has a user interface for interrupting a job sent to the imaging device with an action selected from the group including canceling a job, continuing a job, and modifying a job.

39-40. canceled

41.   (previously presented)   A method for maintaining an imaging device job history on a client, the method comprising:

sending jobs, along with a network address associated with a client sending the jobs, to an imaging device for printing;

making a record of the jobs;

maintaining the job record after the performance of the jobs on the imaging device printing the job;

sending the job record to the client; and,

at the client, filtering the job record to retain a history associated with a client by matching the client network address to jobs having the same network address.

42.   (previously presented)   A system for selectively maintaining an imaging device job history on a client, the system comprising:

a client having an interface for sending jobs along with a client network address;

an imaging device having an interface to accept jobs, the imaging device printing the jobs for the client;

a repository residing in the imaging device having an interface to accept a record of the jobs performed by the imaging device, the repository maintaining the job record after the performance of the job, and sending the job record to the client upon request; and,

wherein the client filters the job record by matching the client network address to jobs having the same network address to create filtered history of jobs associated with the client.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

NONE

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

NONE